

**FAQs**  
**Fee-for-Service Business Practices**  
(These FAQs apply only to Service Provider Organizations Designated as ESAM Sites)

**Service Agreements**

**1). Will my old Key Codes in ETAS be available once ESAM is activated?**

This depends on which ETAS option is chosen by your organization:

**Option A. No connection between ESAM and ETAS.** If the Service Provider Organization (SPO) decides to run ESAM and ETAS independently then Key Codes can be maintained. This means that each time a Service Agreement is opened in ESAM a corresponding Key Code in ETAS will need to be manually created using the same Cost Account Number as used in ESAM.

**Option B. ESAM and ETAS are electronically linked by the Work Order ID (WOID).** This will require a one-time reconciliation of all WOID/Key Codes in both systems. All Key Codes in ETAS will be deactivated and replaced with new ESAM WOIDs. This is done by creating all new WOIDs in ESAM. Each WOID is assigned one of three Work Types: Service Agreements (SA), Program Accounts, or Overhead Accounts. Existing Program Account and Overhead Account will need to be established in ESAM on a one time basis as part of the ESAM system start-up. Work Orders in ESAM are assigned a status: Pending, Open, or Closed. A WOID placed in “Open” status in ESAM will have the identical WOID automatically activated in ETAS. Likewise an existing WOID put in Pending or Closed status will be automatically deactivated in ETAS.

**2). Will projects being performed by Service Provider Organizations (SPOs) already underway in FY 2009 require a service agreement at the start of FY 2010 (does not apply to Program Offices)?**

**Option A:** No. However, new technical services work started in October 2009 and beyond will be subject to the Fee-for-Service business practices in CMP TRMR-26.

**Option B:** Yes. (See above FAQ); projects underway in SPOs as of September 2009 that need to continue into FY2010 will need to establish a Work Order ID (WOID) in ETAS. Starting in FY2010 all WOIDs in SPOs will originate in ESAM as one of the following three Work Types: Service Agreement, Program Account, or Overhead Account. A WOID in ESAM having an “Open” status will immediately be activated in ETAS and available for labor charges. New technical services work started in October 2009 and beyond will be subject to the Fee-for-Service business practices in CMP TRMR-26.

**3). If the project involves a multidisciplinary team (more than one service provider), with employees from different SPO offices, who develops the service agreement(s)? Will there be one large agreement that covers all disciplines, or will each functional group or office prepare one?**

Each SPO must create its own unique Service Agreement with unique charge number. Unfortunately for the FY2010 release SPOs cannot share identical WOIDs (charge numbers). A *program* office, on the other hand, can continue to use a charge number that it has given to a single SPO, (but it can give the charge number to only one SPO).

**4). Shouldn't there be a Reclamation-wide standard naming convention for WOIDs?**

We tried to accomplish a standard naming convention in this version but failed to do so due to the legacy data bases and hard coded restrictions. We will focus on this goal in later versions.

**5). How do we manage multi-phase projects (e.g. NEPA/Design-Spec/Construction)? Would each phase be done separately, or can they be handled jointly?**

The choice of using either multiple/phased Service Agreements or a single/long-term Service Agreement is up to the Program Office. ESAM SA's may be redefined at any time. ESAM will keep a history time stamp for all changes made to budget and/or schedule.

**6). The \$10,000 threshold for using service agreements seems too low.**

The COG sought to balance the objective of minimizing new reporting burdens with the goal of capturing a meaningful volume of technical services work. Data from TSC's past fee-for-service experience was used as a guide to select the \$10,000 threshold. For repetitive and/or ongoing technical services work, Program Offices will have the option to use blanket service agreements or extensions/modifications to existing service agreements, if such approaches prove more effective than using smaller, individual agreements.

**7). How or will financial data (cost authorities) be transferred over the life of a project when the project spans multiple fiscal years (overhead rates change), or when cost authorities change? Will new service agreements be required each year?**

Financial data will be tracked for each Service Agreement per the corresponding cost authority and should not necessarily require new Service Agreements each FY. If it proves useful for a Program Office to establish new Service Agreements each FY, that can be done at their discretion. It is a good business practice to close and reopen a

SA at the end of the FY to maintain a record of the end of FY budget, actual cost and, schedule accomplishments and the corresponding new FY budget and schedule.

**8). ESAM should not just be a tool for the COG; it should provide a level of serviceability for the COG, service providers, and program offices. As Reclamation moves forward with its project management policies, ESAM could become an integral piece of project management if it is made functional for the people using it on a day to day basis.**

While ESAM is **not** a Project Management System as such, it can help greatly in the effectiveness of project management. It does this by containing the budget and schedule estimates with the actual cost and accomplishment. The one-to-one relationship with ESAM and ETAS allows very efficient containment of labor cost by internal Reclamation service provider organizations. In the future, ESAM will allow for additional Project Management features to be input, stored, and printed. This will be a great advantage in that the creation of a PMP will occur in only one place – ESAM - as opposed to ESAM and WORD for example. Unfortunately, this feature will not be available in the first release. It is anticipated that this and other features will be available in future releases, scheduled for later in FY 2010.

**9). Several Area Offices complete what the COG has determined to be technical services work. By not requiring service agreements for this work, how can the COG determine if technical services work is being effectively managed Reclamation-wide?**

The COG's objective, as dictated by the Deputy Commissioner of Operations, was to develop a business model based on an 80% solution, rather than a 100% solution that could not get implemented in the short-term. As the business model is implemented and becomes a standard practice, other Reclamation service providers may be added.

**10). How is the COG going to handle service agreements for work outsourced to private industry service providers?**

ESAM can track outside work as well, but it **will not** initially track outside work not managed by one of the nine identified service provider offices.

**11). How is ESAM/COG going to handle project closeout and additional project information sharing?**

The form will be available in ESAM this year.

**12). Will everyone have signatory approval?**

No. Only level 3 (account managers, supervisors, client liaisons, etc.) and 4 (administrative control) users have SA approval rights. Level 2 users (Team Leader,

Project Managers) can create SAs and modify only the SA's they create. Level 1 (Team Members) have read only privilege.

**13). Can a user modify other service provider's service agreements?**

Only the level 2 user who created the SA can change it. Level 3 and level 4 users can change SAs as well, but only SAs in their ESAM Realm.

**Cost Authority Numbers**

**14). Why is it necessary to have a unique cost authority for each SA – can't person-specific info be pulled from FIRS to get the desired result?**

One CA can be used to cover multiple tasks and subtasks under one project; however, having multiple projects under one CA would not allow ESAM to differentiate project-specific costs/staff without significant manual effort to break out and assign labor charges.

**15). How can we minimize disruption & complication of current standing cost authorities that have related O&M cost distribution applications?**

Program Office staff should plan ahead to structure cost authorities as appropriate and/or explore the use of alternative approaches (blanket service agreements or extensions to service agreements, e.g.) to develop a workable solution.

**16). How will we control numerous close-out/start-up actions for cost authorities as project stages progress?**

Once a service agreement is closed out via a completion report, the corresponding cost authority could be re-used for a subsequent service agreement.

**17). What kind of logic/structure can be used to organize cost authority numbering?**

This will best be determined by Program Offices based on current program needs and the desired approach for service agreement implementation.

**18). How will it work if Program Office (Area Office) staff also charge to the cost authority used for a Service Provider service agreement?**

This should not be a problem – The program office may share a cost authority with one SPO office, but only one SPO office. This is a constraint only for Phase I. In Phase II we will investigate the possibility of allowing shared cost accounts.

**19). If contracted work is part of a project, how will that be included in ESAM – since contracts will serve as independent, external Service Agreements? Will TSC work that’s part of a larger project have its own Service Agreement or operate solely under the project Service Agreement?**

The fee-for-service business practices are flexible enough to use a service agreement for an entire project, or for component parts of a project. ESAM can track Non-labor as well as Labor charges. Each program office may decide how to formulate one or more service agreements to encompass all of the services needed, and is responsible for managing the different components of the project. However, for the FY2009 release of ESAM, a Program Office may share a charge number with only one Service Provider Office (SPO) at a time. Multiple charge numbers will need to be used if multiple SPOs are used on a given project.

Example: If Grand Coulee wishes to use the PN Region SPO and the TSC (also a SPO) it would require unique charge numbers (and therefore unique service agreements) for each SPO. This is a Phase I constraint (see comment in above FAQ)

**20). Why isn’t CARMA being used since it’s already in place?**

CARMA was fully considered for use in developing and tracking service agreements. However, CARMA is not currently used Reclamation-wide, and costs/schedule for developing a CARMA service agreement application did not meet COG objectives. CARMA is not currently installed in any of the 9 SPOs. As a result, the ESAM system has been developed, based on an E-TAS user interface and existing databases.

**ESAM IMPLEMENTATION**

**21). Can service providers set their own schedule for going live on ESAM?**

Yes – schedule can be negotiated within reason

- This will need to be done in the next 3 months
- Lead time will be needed for IT and TSC support

**22). Can service provider offices go live independently or do all have to wait for the last service provider to be ready?**

They can go independently.

**23). Can there be duplicative key codes/WOIDS within realm? Across Reclamation?**

Option A (ETAS switch 1) Key codes have a one-to-one relationship within each timekeeping location (different timekeeping locations can have different key codes tied to the same cost authority)

Option B (ETAS switch 3) WOIDS are one-to-one relationships with cost authorities and thereby unique within the ESAM Reclamation-wide.

**24). What steps do Service Provider Offices need to take to be ready to go live on ESAM?**

- 1) ESAM will be installed at the TSC on 11-10-2009. The Web URL will be live but non-TSC users will not be activated. The TSC will test ESAM for one pay period.
- 2) After a successful pay period run for the TSC, all users will be activated in ESAM
- 3) Option A. Users may now begin to use ESAM to create SAs. SPO must establish business practices for aligning Key Codes in ETAS with WOIDS in ESAM. Business practices from the development team are forth coming.
- 4) Option B. Set up new location in ETAS. Begin creating all charge accounts in ESAM. Schedule switchover to connect ETAS (if going that route)

**25). Does a service provider that has both technical services and program services have to link their ETAS key codes to ESAM WOIDS?**

No – there are three settings for the connectivity between ETAS and ESAM

- 1) **All ETAS-** This means that service providers create their service agreement in ESAM, they then separately create a key code in ETAS. If both use the same cost authority, then costs recorded through labor charges in ETAS to that cost authority will show up in reports of actual costs in ESAM.
- 2) **Mixture of ETAS and ESAM-** (New feature that would have to be programmed) The concept is that ETAS would have access to ESAM WOIDS and could be supplemented by ETAS key codes.
- 3) **All ESAM-** This means that ETAS can only use WOIDS that are established in ESAM.

**26). Who flips the switch to go live on ESAM?**

IT will set ESAM up on a URL – when it's live, it's live for all users.